REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 11, 13-15, and 18 are amended. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

I. Formal Matters

Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Zhao for the telephonic interview that occurred between Examiner Zhao and the undersigned, Jodi Hartman, on January 24, 2008. The 35 U.S.C. §112 rejection was initially discussed, and the undersigned noted that sufficient support for the recitations of the claims was provided in United States Patent Application No. 10/674,770, which was properly incorporated by reference when the current application was filed. Examiner Zhao noted that he would consider this argument.

During the interview, the double patenting rejection was also discussed. In particular, the undersigned noted that the double patenting rejection is improper because references were used to make the rejection that do not have the same inventive entity as the current application, do not have a common inventor with the current application, are not assigned to a common assignee as the current application, and did not result from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement with the current application. Examiner Zhao noted that he would consider this argument.

In addition, the undersigned discussed claim 1 and the failure of United States Patent Application No. 2003/0154009 to Basir et al. to anticipate the recitations of claim 1. Examiner Zhao noted that he would consider the arguments and also noted that any significant amendments to the claims would likely require a new search.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. In particular, the Office Action asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to

6

reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

As discussed in the previous Response filed on September, 12, 2007, claims 1, 11, and 18 were amended to include recitations supported by the specification of United States Patent Application No. 10/674,770 (hereinafter "'770 application") that has published as United States Patent Publication No. 2005/0068417, which is incorporated by reference in the current application at paragraph [0003]. Since the current application and the '770 application were filed on the same day, the application number for the '770 application could not be provided when the current application was filed. However, the attorney docket number, filing date, and title of the '770 application were provided in the current application as filed, which are sufficient to identify the '770 application. *See, In re* Fouche, 439 F.2d 1237.

Although the pending claims are amended as illustrated above and may or may not contain recitations for which the final Office Action asserted were insufficiently described in the specification, the specification of the current application properly incorporates by reference the '770 application, which has published, and thus supports the recitations of the pending claims in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the current application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

III. Double Patenting Rejection

    A. Claims 1, 3-18, and 20

Claims 1, 3-18, and 20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6-9, 11, 15, and 18 of co-pending Application No. 10/674,840 (hereinafter "'840 application") and further in view of United States Patent Application No. 2003/0154009 to Basir et al. (hereinafter "Basir"). The final Office Action notes that the '840 application was filed on September 12, 2007. However, Applicants would like to respectfully submit that the '840 application was actually filed on September 30, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse this double patenting rejection.

As discussed in MPEP §804(I)(B), a provisional double patenting rejection may be issued if "the examiner becomes aware of two co-pending applications that were filed by the same

inventive entity, or by different inventive entities having a common inventor, and/or by a common assignee, or that claim an invention resulting from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement as defined in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3), that would raise an issue of double patenting if one of the applications became a patent." Applicants respectfully assert that Basir was not filed by the same inventive entity as the current application, does not have an inventor in common with the current application, is not assigned to a common assignee, and did not result from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement. In particular, the inventors of Basir are Otman A. Basir, Fakhreddine Karray, Kristopher Desrochers, Jean-Pierre Bhavnani, David Bullock, and Inam Rahim, unlike the inventors of the current application which are Barrett Morris Kreiner and Joseph E. Page Jr. Further, the Assignee for Basir is Intelligent Mechatronic Systems, Inc., unlike the Assignee for the current application which is BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation now doing business as AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the double patenting rejection with regards to Basir is improper and should be withdrawn.

Even if, for the sake of argument, Basir is an appropriate secondary reference for a double patenting rejection, by using Basir in combination with the '840 application to assert the double patenting rejection, the Office Action appears to be asserting that the claims of the '840 application are somehow deficient in making obvious the claims of the current application and has to rely on Basir to remedy allegedly those deficiencies. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims of the current application are patentably distinct from the current claims of the '840 application.

If the double patenting rejection is maintained in light of the '840 application, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims as amended in the current application are patentably distinct from the current claims of '840 application and request withdrawal of this double patenting rejection. Since the claims of the current application and the '840 application have been amended through prosecution, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the double patenting rejection.

B. Claims 2, 14, and 19

Claims 2, 14, and 19 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 6-9, 11, 15, and 18 of

the '840 application and Basir as applied to claims 1, 2-18, and 20 and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. US2005/0021197 to Zimmerman et al. (hereinafter "Zimmerman"). Again, the final Office Action notes that the '840 application was filed on September 12, 2007. However, Applicants would like to respectfully submit that the '840 application was actually filed on September 30, 2003. Applicants respectfully traverse this double patenting rejection.

As discussed above, a provisional double patenting rejection may be issued if "the examiner becomes aware of two copending applications that were filed by the same inventive entity, or by different inventive entities having a common inventor, and/or by a common assignee, or that claim an invention resulting from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement as defined in 35 U.S.C. 103(c)(2) and (3), that would raise an issue of double patenting if one of the applications became a patent." MPEP §804(I)(B). Applicants respectfully assert that Basir was not filed by the same inventive entity as the current application, does not have an inventor in common with the current application, is not assigned to a common assignee, and did not result from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement. In particular, the inventors of Basir are Otman A. Basir, Fakhreddine Karray, Kristopher Desrochers, Jean-Pierre Bhavnani, David Bullock, and Inam Rahim, unlike the inventors of the current application which are Barrett Morris Kreiner and Joseph E. Page Jr. Further, the Assignee for Basir is Intelligent Mechatronic Systems, Inc., unlike the Assignee for the current application which is BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation now doing business as AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that the double patenting rejection with regards to Basir is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicants further assert that Zimmerman was not filed by the same inventive entity as the current application, does not have an inventor in common with the current application, is not assigned to a common assignee, and did not result from activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement. In particular, the inventors of Zimmerman are Kelly L. Zimmerman and Scott P. Zimmerman, unlike the inventors of the current application which are Barrett Morris Kreiner and Joseph E. Page Jr. Further, Zimmerman does not appear to be assigned, unlike the current application which is assigned to BellSouth Intellectual Property Corporation now doing business as AT&T Delaware Intellectual Property, Inc. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert

that the double patenting rejection with regards to Zimmerman is improper and should be withdrawn.

If the double patenting rejection is maintained in light of the '840 application, Applicants respectfully assert that the claims as amended in the current application are patentably distinct from the current claims of co-pending Application No. 10/624,840. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this double patenting rejection.

IV. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Basir. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a method comprises receiving vehicular data describing powertrain management system information, electrical management system information, and chassis management system information; storing a set of rules specifying the vehicular data that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory; when the vehicular data satisfies a rule, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including features recited by claim 1. On the contrary, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including receiving an eccentric event signal; when the eccentric event is received, continuing to record for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when the eccentric event signal is received, transferring the contents of the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Instead, Basir describes that when the eccentric event signal is received, recording is continued for a fixed period of time, and then once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory.

10

The Office Action points to paragraphs [0040-0041] of Basir for support of its alleged assertion that Basir teaches "when the vehicular data satisfies a rule, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory" as recited by claim 1. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office Action's assertion that these paragraphs anticipate the recitations of claim 1. Paragraphs [0040-0041] of Basir are reproduced below:

> [0040] This data is stored directly in non-volatile storage (9) and is updated immediately after one of the events or statistics changes.
>
> [0041] The occupant of the vehicle may choose to store events permanently for later retrieval at any time by using the user-trigger (7). This trigger simulates the occurrence of
>
> an eccentric event, and therefore causes the control units (2) of the data capture and video capture modules to continue recording for a fixed period of time, and then transfer the contents of the volatile (8) memory to the non-volatile memory (9).

Paragraph [0040] of Basir is better understood in light of the preceding paragraphs [0037]-[0039] of Basir which describe that significant events and statistics pertaining to a vehicle, such as the number of times the speed of the vehicle went over 130km/h, can be stored directly in non-volatile storage and updated immediately after one of the events or statistics changes. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir describes that changes in events or statistics associated with a vehicle are stored in non-volatile memory, without teaching, suggesting, or describing transferring contents of a loop buffer to memory when vehicular data satisfies a rule where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to memory.

Paragraph [0041] of Basir describes, as discussed above, continuing to record for a fixed period of time when an eccentric event, or a trigger simulating the occurrence of an eccentric event, is received, and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. Again, this is not analogous to the recitations of

claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory when the eccentric event signal is received.

Moreover, Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video data is tagged with metadata describing the rule that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claims 6, 8, and 10 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 8, and 10 are also allowable over Basir. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Krishnamurthy

Claims 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent No. 6,496,607 to Krishnamurthy et al. (hereinafter "Krishnamurthy"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A. Claims 11, 13, 15, and 16 are allowable.

As amended, claim 11 recites that a method comprises storing a set of rules specifying a particular occurrence that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory and a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to memory; receiving information regarding an occurrence; when the occurrence matches the particular occurrence specified in the set of rules or is within the region of interest in a picture frame specified by the set of rules, then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents of the loop buffer providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the

12

loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including the features recited in claim 11. In contrast, as discussed above, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including receiving an eccentric event signal; when the eccentric event is received, continuing to record for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when the eccentric event signal is received, transferring the contents of the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Instead, Basir describes that when the eccentric event signal is received, recording is continued for a fixed period of time and then once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory.

Basir describes that an eccentric event causing an eccentric event signal is any up-normality with respect to predefined normal operating conditions such as recognizing a state of stress or drowsiness of a driver or recognizing rowdy in-vehicle passenger behavior. This is also not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that an eccentric event includes any occurrence within a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames. In fact, Basir fails to describe any concern with regard to a region of interest of a picture frame of the captured video data.

In addition, Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video data is tagged with metadata describing the rule that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Krishnamurthy allegedly to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Basir. However, like Basir, Krishnamurthy does not teach, suggest, or describe the features recited by claim 11. On the contrary, Krishnamurthy describes a method for classifying regions of an image, based on the relative importance of various areas, and using the importance information to allocate resources so that the important regions of the image are enhanced. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 11 because Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe storing a set of rules specifying a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to memory. Instead, Krishnamurthy describes identifying regions of importance of an image and then enhancing those regions, without teach, suggesting, or describing storing a set of rules specifying a region of interest of an image within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of a loop buffer to memory.

In addition, Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules or is within the region of interest in a picture frame specified by the set of rules where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Moreover, Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claims 13, 15, and 16 depend from claim 11 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 13, 15, and 16 are also allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

B. Claims 18 and 20 are allowable.

As amended, claim 18 recites that a method comprises specifying at least one of i) multiple regions of interest within a single picture frame and ii) multiple regions of disinterest within the single picture frame; storing a set of rules specifying the vehicular data that causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to the memory; when the vehicular data satisfies a rule,

14

then transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory, the contents of the loop buffer transferred at a bitrate associated with the region of interest, the contents of the loop buffer providing at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data, the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory; and tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

Basir does not teach, suggest, or describe a method including the features recited in claim 18. In contrast, as discussed above, Basir describes a method for monitoring and analyzing real time visual and non-visual information including receiving an eccentric event signal; when the eccentric event is received, continuing to record for a fixed period of time; and once this time has elapsed, copying the data from a volatile memory, such as a circular buffer, to a non-volatile memory. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that when the eccentric event signal is received, transferring the contents of the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Instead, Basir describes that when the eccentric event signal is received, recording is continued for a fixed period of time and then once that fixed period of time has elapsed, the data from the volatile memory is copied to the non-volatile memory.

Basir also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory. Instead, Basir describes stamping the video data so that when the data is retrieved, the video data can be synchronized with playback of non-visual vehicle and occupant data. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 1 because Basir fails to teach, suggest, or describe that the video data is tagged with metadata describing the rule that caused the video data to be copied from the volatile memory to the non-volatile memory. Basir only describes that the video data is stamped so that synchronized playback with non-visual vehicle and occupant data is possible.

Moreover, Basir completely fails to teach, suggest, or describe specifying at least one of multiple regions of interest within a single picture frame and multiple regions of disinterest

within the single picture frame and transferring the contents of a loop buffer at a bitrate associated with the region of interest.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Krishnamurthy allegedly to cure the above-identified deficiencies of Basir. However, like Basir, Krishnamurthy does not teach, suggest, or describe the features recited by claim 18. On the contrary, Krishnamurthy describes a method for classifying regions of an image, based on the relative importance of various areas, and using the importance information to allocate resources so that the important regions of the image are enhanced. This is not analogous to the method recited by claim 18 because Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when vehicular data satisfies a rule, where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Moreover, Krishnamurthy fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 18 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claim 20 depends from claim 18 and recites further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is also allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

VI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir

Claims 3, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As noted above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claims 3, 4, and 5 depend from claim 1 and recite further claim features, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3, 4, and 5 are also allowable over Basir.

VII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Maeda

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent No. 6,763,071 to Maeda et al. (hereinafter "Maeda"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 9 depends from claim 1 and recites further features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is also allowable over Basir. In addition, Maeda fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Maeda describes a method for protecting intellectual property rights of an image including entering image data encoded with plural modes and security data for protecting the image data; determining, based on the security data, whether reproduction of the encoded image data is permitted; and decoding the encoded image data based on the results of the determination. Like Basir, Maeda fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of a loop buffer to a memory when vehicular data satisfies a rule, where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data. Moreover, Maeda also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 9 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Maeda. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VIII. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Fiore

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of United States Patent Publication No. 2002/0191952 to Fiore et al. (hereinafter "Fiore"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 7 depends from claim 1 and recites further features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is also allowable over Basir. In addition, Fiore fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Fiore describes a method for receiving and temporarily storing input signal data including receiving an event signal; extracting the signal data from a circular storage buffer, and storing the data into a file system. However, like Basir, Fiore fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data with metadata describing a rule that caused the contents of the circular storage buffer to be transferred to the file system.

For at least these reasons, claim 7 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Fiore. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IX. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir and Zimmerman

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Zimmerman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Basir. Since claim 2 depends from claim 1 and recites further claim features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 2 is also allowable over Basir. In addition, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of Basir. In particular, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless communication to communication the vehicular data. However, like Basir, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of a loop buffer to a memory when vehicular data satisfies a rule, where the contents provide at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data. Moreover, Zimmerman also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 2 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Zimmerman. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

X. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Zimmerman

Claims 14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Zimmerman. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A. Claim 14 is allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claim 14 depends from claim 11 and recites further features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 is also allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In addition, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In particular, as discussed above, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless

communication to communication the vehicular data. However, like Basir and Krishnamurthy, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe storing a set of rules specifying a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to memory. Moreover, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules or is within the region of interest in a picture frame specified by the set of rules where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Zimmerman also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 14 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Zimmerman. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully traversed.

B. Claim 19 is allowable.

For at least the reasons given above, claim 18 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claim 19 depends from claim 18 and recites further features, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is also allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In addition, Zimmerman fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In particular, as discussed above, Zimmerman describes a method for communicating a diagnostic message from a vehicle including receiving vehicular data at a vehicular data acquisition and communication device and initiating a wireless communication to communication the vehicular data. However, like Basir and Krishnamurthy, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of a loop buffer to a memory when vehicular data satisfies a rule, where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding in time an event associated with the vehicular data that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Moreover, Zimmerman fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-

delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

For at least these reasons, claim 19 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Zimmerman. Therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

XI. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103 Over Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Maeda

Claims 12 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Basir in view of Krishnamurthy and further in view of Maeda. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For at least the reasons give above, claim 11 is allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. Since claims 12 and 17 depend from claim 11 and recite further features, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 17 are also allowable over the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In addition, Maeda fails to cure the deficiencies of the combined teaching of Basir and Krishnamurthy. In particular, as discussed above, Maeda describes a method for protecting intellectual property rights of an image including entering image data encoded with plural modes and security data for protecting the image data; determining, based on the security data, whether reproduction of the encoded image data is permitted; and decoding the encoded image data based on the results of the determination. However, like Basir and Krishnamurthy, Maeda fails to teach, suggest, or describe storing a set of rules specifying a region of interest in a picture frame of the series of picture frames within which any occurrence causes a transfer of contents of the loop buffer to memory. Moreover, Maeda fails to teach, suggest, or describe transferring the contents of the loop buffer to the memory when an occurrence matches a particular occurrence specified in a set of rules or is within the region of interest in a picture frame specified by the set of rules where the contents include at least one of time-delayed audio data and time-delayed video data preceding the occurrence that causes the transfer of the contents of the loop buffer to the memory. Maeda also fails to teach, suggest, or describe tagging at least one of the time-delayed audio data and the time-delayed video data with metadata describing the rule that caused the contents of the loop buffer to be transferred to the memory.

20

For at least these reasons, claims 12 and 17 are allowable over the combined teaching of Basir, Krishnamurthy, and Maeda. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the final Office Action, and respectfully request that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1-20 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' attorney at 404.815.1900.

Respectfully submitted,

HOPE BALDAUFF HARTMAN, LLC

Date: January 31, 2008

/Jodi L. Hartman/
Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251

Hope Baldauff Hartman, LLC
1720 Peachtree Street, NW
Suite 1010
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
Telephone: 404.815.1900

> **53377**
> PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE